



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | | |
|---|-------------|----------------------|--|------------------|----------|--------------|
| 10/696,895 | 10/30/2003 | Joseph G. Laura | IDF 2505 (4000-14700) | 9244 | | |
| 28003 | 7590 | 05/21/2007 | <table border="1"><tr><td>EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td>KISS, ERIC B</td></tr></table> | | EXAMINER | KISS, ERIC B |
| EXAMINER | | | | | | |
| KISS, ERIC B | | | | | | |
| SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | | 2192 | | | |
| | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| | | 05/21/2007 | PAPER | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/696,895 | LAURA, JOSEPH G. | |
| | Examiner Eric B. Kiss | Art Unit 2192 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Eric B. Kiss. (3) _____

(2) Brian Genco (Reg. No. 58,096). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 15 May 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1,18,23 and 35.

Identification of prior art discussed: PERCOBOL.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Parties discussed proposed amendments to the claims with the aim of more clearly distinguishing the claims over the prior art. The examiner indicated that because of broad definitions of "technical layer" and "COBOL" in the Specification, the proposed amendments did not appear to distinguish the claims over the prior art of record (for example, it is not clear at what point adding non-standard features to a COBOL program makes it a non-COBOL program and at what point a technical layer which adds such non-standard features would be considered a non-COBOL technical layer). The examiner also expressed concern over the proposed language of "bit-level operating system calls", which Mr. Genco explained referred to a feature of COBOL that provides some capability of accessing an operating system through the creation of a specialized bit stream (referring to paragraph [0045] of the Specification). The examiner suggested that the execution of a binary form of code (such as, for example, the JAVA code output from the PERCOBOL compiler) could be reasonably interpreted as including bit-level operating system calls. The examiner suggested that further distinction of the bit-level operating system calls from such binary code execution may be helpful, but the examiner was unable to propose any specific claim language.